



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,136	01/12/2001	Stephen Nuss	990356.ORI	2264

23595 7590 08/24/2004

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
SUITE 820
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

FOREMAN, JONATHAN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3736

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/760,136

Applicant(s)

NUSS, STEPHEN

Examiner

Jonathan ML Foreman

Art Unit

3736

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,132,389 to Cornish et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,817,600 to Herms et al.

In regards to claims 12 – 27, Cornish et al. discloses a guidewire comprising a core wire having a proximal end and a distal end, the distal end having a smaller diameter than the proximal end; a taper of the diameter between the distal end and the proximal end with the distal end being smaller (Col. 3, line 66 – Col. 4, line 14); a coil (20) attached to the distal end; a distal tip (58) on the distal end; a polymer coating and a hydrophilic coating (Col. 3, lines 50 – 60). Cornish et al. discloses the wire being formed of any suitable alloy (Col. 3, lines 42 – 47). However, Cornish et al. fails to disclose the alloy being a titanium molybdenum alloy having approximately 78% titanium, 11.5% molybdenum, 6% zirconium and 4.5% tin by weight. Herms et al. discloses a medical device for inserting into body passageways during medical procedures including a titanium molybdenum alloy wire having approximately 78% titanium, 11.5% molybdenum, 6% zirconium and 4.5% tin by weight (Col. 4, lines 27 – 35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wire as disclosed by Cornish et al. to be formed of a titanium molybdenum alloy as taught by Herms et al. because the titanium molybdenum alloy has

Art Unit: 3736

about three times as much elasticity as other possible alloys and thus helps to avoid unwanted permanent deformation (Col. 6, lines 3 – 6).

Response to Amendment

2. The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 5/17/04 in addition to Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/04 is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 12 - 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornish et al. and the rejection of claims 12 - 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornish et al. in view of Mayer.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 12 – 27 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,132,389 to Cornish et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,817,600 to Herms et al., Applicant has asserted that Herms et al. teaches away from the claimed invention because Herms et al. is directed to an expandable filter that hooks onto the walls of a blood vessel as opposed to a guidewire which is intended to smoothly pass through a blood vessel. However, the Examiner disagrees. The teaching relied upon from Herms et al. is that the claimed alloy exhibits properties that would be desirable in a guidewire, i.e. avoid unwanted permanent deformation (Col. 6, lines 3 – 6). It is well known in the guidewire art that permanent deformation is unwanted in a guidewire. This can be seen in U.S. Patent No. 5,772,609 to Nguyen et al. at Col. 1, lines 59 – 63 which states, “a guidewire should be resistant to kinking. Kinking refers to a condition where the guidewire has been plastically deformed and is often characterized by a permanent localized deformation where the wire was kinked”. Accordingly, the Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 12 – 27 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,132,389 to Cornish et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,817,600 to Herms et al.

Art Unit: 3736

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan ML Foreman whose telephone number is (703) 305-5390. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (703)308-3130. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.



JMLF
August 20, 2004



MAX F. HINDENBURG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700